App.F.IX-4

1925.

File No. 95-25

Previous References (Omgrai)

Serial Nos. 1 — 4

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 4

Part B for June 1926

SUBJECT

Tahsil Jhang Jeggaweena appeals against the order of the Comr directing that the Baraward in the said post be made out in the name of Rajah Liaqat

---

No. 1567, Cabinet dt. 1.6.26

To the Omgrai Comrs.

Subject to certain rectifications the Rly Comrs proposal is confirmed

G. R. S. 11] 1925

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Inzrai)

NOTES.

File No.

FILE HEADING.

Parichanaka and Sripada posts in the Sri Ranganatha Swamy temple at Seringapatam

From

Yeggamma, widow of late Cholkarnicengapa,

No. Petition Dated 24.9.25. Received 24.9.25. 1.10.25.

Diary No. 378	Enclos. 3 Spare Copies.	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Appeals against the Dy. Comrs. order directing that the (C) Said posts be made out in the name of the respdt.— Rajicengar.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

R. The petition is duly stamped. A copy of the Dy. Comrs. order appealed against has been produced.

2) The Dy Comrs. order appealed against is dated 18-7-1925, while the appeal

R. S. III 2]

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 95 of 192

Serial No.

petition was received on 22 9
It is in time.
3) A Dft calling for records is sent for
or Otherwise

AV
2-11

The petition purports to say that the property is hereditary in the applt. family.
The appeal therefore lies to Govt. against the order. Call the records if suitably amended.

Sd
2/10/25

4) As the petition is not clear, the records must be called for

4.10.25

Rev. &c.

5) Records may be called for.

Asst. Members

15.10.25

AV

6) Draft calling for the report with records is in order, if approved

Sd
17.10.25

Sd
17.10.25

NOTE—Contn. sheet

436
22.10.25

WD 0561 - GPB- 3750—1 8 22

1st Member

22.10.25

7) Issue

Sd/ Jones
22.10.25

G. R. S. III. 2]

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 95 of 1926-26

Serial No.

2. To. Muz Commr. No 497 Dy 27.11.25
forwards the above
for report with [illegible]

(3) From. The Muz. Commr. in mysore.
Letter no. 455 of 25.6 Dy 23/3/26
Submits the report with the
records called for in the above.

B 9/ The office-note put up in the Dy. Comrs. office explains the facts of the case.
may the case be posted for hearing?
Submitted for orders.

Chunchunapuri
Mutt Case is posted
to the 6th. May
26.

AV 6.4.1926 10/ The Dy Comrs order appealed against fixes the details of the case, and the order itself seems to be quite reasonable, provided that the appellant is paid her ports for her maintenance regularly. The D.C's order as regards the fragments also is quite clear & reasonable.
Mere do not deserve [illegible]

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 S 22

WD 01264—GPB—40,000 -17-12-25

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No | of 192 .

Serial No

Any grounds for interference there is, on which appeal against. The appeal may perhaps be rejected

~~Record is invited to R.B.~~
Rev. Sec'y

R.L.
7/4/26

7/4

(1) Kind ref^ce is invited to flags B., C., & C., in which the facts of the case leading to the order, appealed against, are set out.

(2) In the circ^ces, the best possible arrangement has been arrived at, by the D.C. Provision has been made for the regular payment of allowance to the appellant for life, by the Respondent.

(3) The D.C's arrangement seems equitable. The appeal may perhaps be rejected.

Rev. Sec'y

7/4

1st member

8/4 9/4

256
9.4

(4) Case may be posted for hearing on 25th inst.

10/4 7/4

5. 12/4

5) D/A. notices for issue.

15.4.26

15/4/26

6) Issue

15/4

App. F. III—2]

File No. of 192 .

General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.	

WD 9i264—GPB —40,000—17 12-25

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat

mer2 File No. 95 of 192 5

Serial No.

4 To, mur Comm & Comptr
No 1567-8 dt 4.6.26
Confirms the D.O's
arrangement to have the duties
performed by Rajiengan on pay mx
of Rs 1-8-0 to the appt he suggests

12/6/26





mesr 95-25-1

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA
OF MYSORE (M U Z R A I DEPARTMENT).

Muzrai Appeal No of 1925 - 26.

**

Yeggamma, widow of late Chokkanniengar,
c/o Mr. Sthanick Nalkane Samyada Srinivasiengar, Melkote. .. APPELLANT.

-VS.-

S. G. Rajiengar, Paricharaka of Sri Ranganathaswami Temple, Seringapatam. .. RESPONDENT.

Presented by B.S. Rhasamanna Rao, Pleader of the Respondent Number 1 on 24/9/25

_*_*_*_*_

UNDER SECTION 21 OF THE MYSORE MUZRAI REGULATION

The appellant above named appeals from the order dated 18th July 1925 (and communicated to petitioner on 26th August 1925 as per endorsement herewith filed) of the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, sanctioning the French Rocks Sub-Division Officer's recommendation to transfer the barraward of the Paricharaka and Sripada posts in the Sri Ranganathaswamy Temple at Seringapatam, which stood in the name of the appellant's deceased husband Chokkanniengar to that of the Respondent Rajiengar, on the following among other grounds:-

1. The learned Deputy Commissioner in sanctioning the proposed arrangement has lost sight of the facts that

(a) the right to the post was acquired by



1-OCT 925
MUZRAI
D. No.
1-OCT 925
MUZRAI
mur 95-25-1

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE (M U Z R A I DEPARTMENT).

Muzrai Appeal No. of 1925 - 26.

**

Yeggamma, widow of late Chokkanniengar, c/o Mr. Sthanick Nalkane Samyada Srinivasiengar, Melkote. .. APPELLANT.

-VS.-

S. Rajiengar, Paricharaka of Sri Ranganathaswami Temple, Seringapatam. .. RESPONDENT.

Presented by B.S. Rhasamanna Rao, Gumasta of Mr B Varadha Rao

****

UNDER SECTION 21 OF THE MYSORE MUZRAI REGULATION

The appellant above named appeals from the order dated 18th July 1925 (and communicated to petitioner on 26th August 1925 as per endorsement herewith filed) of the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, sanctioning the French Rocks Sub-Division Officer's recommendation to transfer the barraward of the Paricharaka and Sripada posts in the Sri Ranganathaswamy Temple at Seringapatam, which stood in the name of the appellant's deceased husband Chokkanniengar to that of the Respondent Rajiengar, on the following among other grounds:-

1. The learned Deputy Commissioner in sanctioning the proposed arrangement has lost sight of the facts that

(a) the right to the post was acquired by the

the deceased husband of the appellant, Chokkanniengar the fact of which was - found in appellant's favour by the Sub-Division Officer so far back as 11th December 1904;

(b). that the Respondent has no manner of right to the post as the right to the office does not belong to the joint family of the appellant's husband but is his self-acquisition; and

(c). that the respondent Rajiengar preferred no claim at all in the proceedings before the Sub-Division Officer and when his order - dated 24th February 1918 was passed.

2. The learned Deputy Commissioner in - passing the order appealed from has ignored the observation that of his predecessor in office that "the existence of no claim by either party has been recognised and the entire question requires to be opened and set at rest by some reasonable and equitable arrangement under the present existing circumstances".

3. The learned Deputy Commissioner has not considered the circumstances that the respondent is not qualified for the post as he has been suspended from office and fined several times.

4. The learned Deputy Commissioner erred in ignoring the order of the Amildar passed in 1908 directing joint baraward in the name of the appel-

appellant and the respondent; and the fact that the said order had been reversed by the Sub-Division Officer without notice to the appellant and the fact not even being intimated to her.

5. The learned Deputy Commissioner in - making the order for p ayment of Re.1/- only per mensem to the appellant by the Respondent has not considered the fact tnat the appellant is in any event entitled to a share in the increased emoluments of the office of Paricharike alone, which are a pay of Rs.8/- per mensem and an allowance of 10 seers of rice. In any case the allowance ordered to be - made to the appellant is miserably small considering the fact that it is her only means of her sub-sistence and she is a poor and helpless widow who lost her husband during her minority. Others are quite ready to officiate at very much more favourable terms to the appellant.

6. The learned Deputy Commissioner's order is opposed to law as in any case during the lifetime of the appellant she is entitled under the Hindu Law to the whole of the emoluments of the office less - what may have to be paid to the person who actually does the duties and also to the baraward Hak which there is absolutely no justification or reason why she should be deprived of.

7. Further, assuming without conceding that the Deputy Commissioner passed his ~~final~~ office order rightly inasmuch as the respondent did not act up

even to the terms of the preliminary office order of the Deputy Commissioner and pay according thereto but raised frivolous objections the order itself became ipso facto void and the respondent could not again put forward a claim or be granted any relief.

The learned Deputy Commissioner's order and procedure are opposed to Sections 32 and 33 of the Muzrai Regulation as he has not held or got held a proper enquiry and after recording evidence.

B Varadaswamy
for Applt

Bangalore,
24th Septr.1925.

Petitioner.

T. నం. 295/25-26.

శ్రీ రంగనాయకస్వామి కొండపై తెప్పోత్సవం

శ్రీ రంగనాయకస్వామి కొండపై తెప్పోత్సవం

even to the terms of the preliminary office



Office of the Deputy Commissioner Mysore District.

Dated Mysore 18th July 1925.

Official Memorandum

Reference :-

Correspondence ending with French Rocks Taluk Division Officer's Yadi No: O.C. 6 of 25-26 dated 13th July 1925 reporting that Rajiengar has paid the appellant Neggamma the arrears of allowance due to her at Re: 1/- a month up to the present date; that Rajiengar has agreed to abide by the conditions set forth in this office order No: Petition 121 of 23 M dated 25th December 1923 and recommending that the Pareward of Paricharike and Sripada post, in the Sri Ranganathaswami temple at Seringapatam standing in the name of Neggamma may be ordered to be transferred to the name of Rajiengar.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE
MYSORE
DISTRICT

Memo No: R. Dis: 12/25-26 Mysore

The recommendation of the Sub division officer French Rock, transferring the karaward of Parichanke and Sri pada poots in the Sri Ranganatha Swamy temple at Seringapatam to the name of Rajiengar is sanctioned, the conditions stipulated in this office order and agreed to by Rajiengar should be strictly enforced.

Sd/ A.V. Ramanathan

18/7/25.

Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

To The Sub division officer, French Rock.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE MYSORE DISTRICT

"Copy"

By order

Sheristadar

Comptd Typed

Huzur Head Munshi

Copy applied on: 15-9-25
" ready on: 15-9-25
" delivered on: 15-9-25.
No: of words: 168
Copying fee 0-4-0
Comparing fee 0-1-0
Total 0-5-0



Before the Govt. of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore at Bangalore.

~~In the Court of the~~

Misc. A CASE NO. OF 1925—1926

Appellant, ~~Plaintiff.~~ *Respondent, ~~Defendant.~~*

Yeggamma vs. S. Rajiengar.

1. ....I....the.....Appellant.....above named do by these presents retain MESSRS. B. VASUDEVAMURTHY, B.A., LL.B., and C. NAGAPPA, B A., LL B., *Advocates*, to appear in and conduct the above case on....my.....behalf to judgment.

2. ....I.....further empower them to execute any decree or order that may be passed in.....my.....behalf and to receive from Court all documents, refunds and such sums of money as.....I.....may be entitled to get and grant receipts therefor.

3. .....I.....also undertake to confirm and ratify all the legal acts done by them in so doing.

BANGALORE
.....29/9/...1925

ವಿ ರಂಗಯ್ಯನವರು

Accepted.

B Vasudeva murthy
C. Nagappa

Advocates for

Signed before me and personaly known to me.

BV.

Advocate.

Printed at the Phœnix Printing House B—City

App.F.W-G1.]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Diary No of letter replied to

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, the 192

Date of issue 27-10-25

T Ramaiya

List of enclosures. . . . .

Copied by . . . .

Examined by .

Section mar

File No. 95-25

Serial No. 2

No. 497/Revenue

To The Dist. Collr.

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith for report with records, petition no. 378 dt 24.9.1925 from Yeggamma widow of late Chokkanangar appealing against the Dy. Coll's order directing that the karamai of the post of Panchayatdar and Sistha in the Sri Ranganatha Swamy temple at Srirangapatna be ...

over

16
Name of Rajdurga
(re spot
before fort).
Dhanada
V. (S).
Dy Rly Engineer
17
2nd
8th 25/10/78

3947/8

No. 455 & 25-6 one big file

Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Dated Bangalore, 23nd March 1926.

From

B. Ramaswamaiya, Esq., B.A., P.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

GEN. SECTT. SECRETARIAT. 24 MAR 1926 MUZRAI

C. 1093

Mus 95-25-3

GEN. SECTT. DR. 23 MAR 1926 G. D. SECTION.

To

B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., P.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His
Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Revenue Department.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.497/Muz.95-25-3 dated 27th October 1925 forwarding for report with records petition from --- Yeggamma, widow of late Chokkaniengar, appealing against the Deputy Commissioner's order directing that the baraward of the posts of Paricharaka and Sripada in the Sri Ranganathaswamy temple at ------ Seringapatam be registered in the name of Rajaiengar, I have the -- honor to submit herewith the entire records received with the ---- Deputy Commissioner's letter No.C.342 of 25-26 dated the 17th ---- March 1926, the facts of the case are stated to have been fully set forth in the preamble to his office order appealed against.

The appeal petition and its enclosures are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
B Ramaswamaiya
Muzrai Commissioner.

KSR.

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Mus. Appeal No. 3 of 1925-26.

Appellant. Vs. Respondent

Yeggamma widow of Chokkanjengar Rajjengar.

Subject.

Appeal against the mysore
no. R. Dis 12/25-26 dt 18.7.1925
& Dy. Comrs. order directing that the Pancharike and Snipada posts of Sri Ranganatha Swamy Temple at Seringapatam be made out in the name of the respt - Rajjengar

Order No 1567-8

The case was heard on 25th May 1926 when the appts advocate (Mr. B. Vasudeva Murthi) was present in person. and the respondent in person was present.

2) The appellant came personally perfor

offices and whatever
her right to them is of value to
her only in so far as it gives
her an allowance for maintenance.
The arrangement of her appointing an
Agent for performing the duties of
these offices has not worked properly
in the past. The order passed by the
Dy. Comr. is reasonable, considering all
the circumstances of the case. The
allowance of Rs 1 per month sanctioned
by him was that settled in 1908.
The emoluments of the respdts have
however been raised from Rs 6/4
Rs 8/ in G.O. no. 639-41/Misc. 379-21-2
dd 9th Aug. 1922, and in view of
this addition, the allowance to be
paid by him & the apltr will be
increased from Rs 1/ to Rs 1-8-0. This
increase will be given effect to from
the date of this order. ~~Subject to~~
3) Subject to this
~~This~~ modification, the Dy. Comr's.
order dated 18th July 1925

G. R. S. G/33]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation sheet draft form.)

is Confirmed.

29/8 BM Rev Secy. 30.5.26

29/5/26

(1) The Insp. Genl. has ref. to his letter no 455 dt 23.3.26 requesting the entire record.

(2) Comptr